arXiv:1605.01686v1 [math.LO] 5 May 2016

The Expressive Power of k-ary Exclusion Logic

Raine Rönnholm
University of Tampere

Abstract

In this paper we study the expressive power of k-ary exclusion logic, EXC[k], that is obtained by extending first order logic with k-ary exclusion atoms. It is known that without arity bounds exclusion logic is equivalent with dependence logic. From the translations between them we see that the expressive power of EXC[k] lies in between k-ary and $(k+1)$-ary dependence logics. We will show that, at least in the case of unary exclusion logic, the both of these inclusions are proper.

In a recent work by the author it was shown that k-ary inclusion-exclusion logic is equivalent with k-ary existential second order logic, ESO[k]. We will show that, on the level of sentences, it is possible to simulate inclusion atoms with exclusion atoms, and this way express ESO[k]-sentences by using only k-ary exclusion atoms. For this translation we also need to introduce a novel method for "unifying" the values of certain variables in a team. As a consequence, EXC[k] captures ESO[k] on the level of sentences, and thus we get a strict arity hierarchy for exclusion logic. It also follows that k-ary inclusion logic is strictly weaker than EXC[k].

1 Introduction

Exclusion logic is an extension of first order logic with *team semantics*. In team semantics the truth of formulas is interpreted by using sets of assignments which are called *teams*. This approach was introduced by Hodges [13] to define compositional semantics for the *IF-logic* by Hintikka and Sandu [11]. The truth for the IF-logic was originally defined by using semantic games of imperfect information ([12]), and in thus teams can be seen as parallel positions in a semantic game. Teams can also be seen as databases ([18]), and thus the study of logics with team semantics has natural connections with the study of database dependencies.

For first order logic team semantics is just a generalization of Tarski semantics and has the same expressive power. But if we extend first order logic with new atomic formulas we get higher expressive power and can define more complex properties of teams. The first new atoms for this framework were *dependence atoms* introduced by Väänänen [18]. In *dependence logic* the semantics for these atoms are defined by functional dependencies of the values of variables in a team. Several new atoms have been presented for this framework with the motivation from simple database dependencies – such as *independence atoms* by Grädel and Väänänen [8] and *inclusion and exclusion atoms* by Galliani [5]. Lately there has been research on these atoms with an attempt to formalize the dependency

phenomena in different fields of science, such as database theory ([15]), belief presentation ([4]) and quantum mechanics ([14]).

If we extend first order logic with inclusion/exclusion atoms we obtain *inclusion and exclusion logics*. The team semantics for these atoms are very simple: Suppose that $\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2$ are k-tuples of terms and X is a team. The k-ary inclusion atom $\vec{t}_1 \subseteq \vec{t}_2$ says that the values of $\vec{t}_1$ are included in the values of $\vec{t}_2$ in the team X. The k-ary exclusion atom $\vec{t}_1 \mid \vec{t}_2$ dually says that $\vec{t}_1$ and $\vec{t}_2$ get distinct values in X, i.e. for all assignments $s, s' \in X$ we have $s(\vec{t}_1) \neq s'(\vec{t}_2)$.

Galliani [5] has shown that without arity bounds exclusion logic is equivalent with dependence logic. Thus, on the level of sentences, it captures *existential second order logic*, ESO ([18]). Inclusion logic is not comparable with dependence logic in general ([5]), but captures *positive greatest fixed point logic* on the level of sentences, as shown by Galliani and Hella [7]. Hence exclusion logic captures NP and inclusion logic captures PTIME over finite structures with linear order.

In order to understand the nature of these atoms, there has been research on the bounded arity fragments of the corresponding logics. Durand and Kontinen [3] have shown that, on the level of sentences, k-ary dependence logic captures the fragment of ESO in which at most $(k-1)$-ary functions can be quantified[1]. From this it follows that dependence logic has a strict arity hierarchy over sentences, since the arity hierarchy of ESO (over arbitrary vocabulary) is known to be strict, as shown by Ajtai [1]. These earlier results, however, do not tell much about the expressive power of k-ary exclusion logic, EXC[k], since the existing translation from it to dependence logic does not respect the arities of atoms.

There has not been much research on exclusion logic after Galliani proved its equivalence with dependence logic. In this paper we will show that the relationship between these two logics becomes nontrivial when we consider their bounded arity fragments. This also leads to results on the relation between inclusion and exclusion logics, which is interesting because they can be seen as duals to each other, as we have argued in [17].

By inspecting Galliani's translations ([5]) between exclusion and dependence logics more closely, we observe that EXC[k] is stronger than k-ary dependence logic but weaker than $(k+1)$-ary dependence logic. Thus it is natural to ask whether the expressive power of EXC[k] is strictly in between k-ary and $(k+1)$-ary dependence logics. We will show that this holds at least when $k = 1$.

In an earlier work by the author [17] it was shown that both INC[k]- and EXC[k]-formulas could be translated into k-ary ESO, ESO[k], which gives us an upper bound for the expressive power of EXC[k]. In [17] it was also shown that conversely ESO[k]-formulas with at most k-ary free relation variables can be expressed in k-ary inclusion-exclusion logic, INEX[k], and consequently INEX[k] captures ESO[k] on the level of sentences.

Since exclusion logic is closed downwards, unlike inclusion-exclusion logic, we know that EXC[k] is strictly weaker than INEX[k]. However, in certain cases we can simulate the use of inclusion atoms with exclusion atoms: Suppose that x, w, w^c are variables such that the sets values of w and w^c in X are complements of each other. Now we have $\mathcal{M} \models_X x \subseteq w$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_X x \mid w^c$. This can be generalized for k-ary atoms if the values of k-tuples $\vec{w}$ and $\vec{w}^c$ are complementary.

[1] See [6] and [9] for similar arity hierarchy results on independence and inclusion logics.

We will use the observation above to modify our translation (in [17]) from ESO[k] to INEX[k]. If we only consider *sentences* of exclusion logic, we can quantify the needed complementary values, and then replace inclusion atoms in the translation with the corresponding exclusion atoms. The remaining problem is that in our translation we also needed a new connective called *term value preserving disjunction* ([17]) to avoid the loss of information on the values of certain variables when evaluating disjunctions. This operator can be defined by using both inclusion and exclusion atoms ([17]), but it is undefinable in exclusion logic since it is not closed downwards.

In [17] we introduced new operators called *inclusion and exclusion quantifiers* and defined them in inclusion-exclusion logic. Furthermore, we showed that *universal inclusion quantifier* ($\forall \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t}$) could be defined also in exclusion logic. We will then consider the use of this quantifier in somewhat trivial looking form ($\forall \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{x}$). This operator turns out to be useful as it "unifies" the values of variables in a team. We will use it to define new operators called *unifier*, *unified existential quantifier* and *unifying disjunction*.

This unifying disjunction will give us an alternative method to avoid the loss of information in the translation from ESO[k]. This completes our translation, and proves the equivalence between EXC[k] and ESO[k] on the level of sentences. Hence we also get a strict arity hierarchy for exclusion logic since the arity hierarchy for ESO is known to be strict. We also get the interesting consequence that k-ary inclusion logic is *strictly* weaker than EXC[k] on the level of sentences.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Syntax and team semantics for first order logic

A vocabulary L is a set of *relation symbols* R, *function symbols* f and *constant symbols* c. The set of *L-terms*, T_L, is defined in the standard way. The set of variables occurring in a tuple $\vec{t}$ of L-terms is denoted by $\mathrm{Vr}(\vec{t})$.

Definition 2.1. FO_L-formulas are defined as follows:

$$\varphi ::= t_1 = t_2 \mid \neg t_1 = t_2 \mid R\vec{t} \mid \neg R\vec{t} \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid (\varphi \vee \varphi) \mid \exists x\, \varphi \mid \forall x\, \varphi$$

FO_L-formulas of the form $t_1 = t_2$, $\neg t_1 = t_2$, $R\vec{t}$ and $\neg R\vec{t}$ are called *literals*.

Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{FO}_L$. We denote the set of *subformulas* of φ by $\mathrm{Sf}(\varphi)$ and the set of variables occurring in φ by $\mathrm{Vr}(\varphi)$. The set of *free variables* of φ, $\mathrm{Fr}(\varphi)$, is defined in the standard way. If $\mathrm{Fr}(\varphi) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ we can emphasize this by writing φ as $\varphi(x_1 \ldots x_n)$.

An *L-model* $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathcal{I})$, where the *universe* M is any nonempty set and the *interpretation* $\mathcal{I}$ is a function whose domain is the vocabulary L. The interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ maps constant symbols to elements in M, k-ary relation symbols to k-ary relations in M and k-ary function symbols to functions $M^k \to M$. For all $k \in L$ we write $k^{\mathcal{M}} := \mathcal{I}(k)$. An *assignment* s for M is a function that is defined in some set of variables, $\mathrm{dom}(s)$, and ranges over M. A *team* X for M is any set of assignments for M with a common domain, denoted by $\mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Let s be an assignment and a be any element in M. The assignment $s[a/x]$ is defined in $\mathrm{dom}(s) \cup \{x\}$, and it maps the variable x to a and all other variables

as s. If $\vec{x} := x_1 \dots x_k$ is a tuple of variables and $\vec{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in M^k$, we write $s[\vec{a}/\vec{x}] := s[a_1/x_1, \dots, a_k/x_k]$. For a team X, a set $A \subseteq M^k$ and for a function $\mathcal{F} : X \to \mathcal{P}(M^k) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ we use the following notations:

$$\begin{cases} X[A/\vec{x}] := \Big\{ s[\vec{a}/\vec{x}] \mid s \in X,\, \vec{a} \in A \Big\} \\ X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}] := \Big\{ s[\vec{a}/\vec{x}] \mid s \in X,\, \vec{a} \in \mathcal{F}(s) \Big\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an L-model, s an assignment and t an L-term s.t. $\mathrm{Vr}(t) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(s)$. The *interpretation of t with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ and s*, is denoted simply by $s(t)$. For a team X and a tuple $\vec{t} := t_1 \dots t_k$ of L-terms we write

$$s(\vec{t}) := (s(t_1), \dots, s(t_k)) \;\text{ and }\; X(\vec{t}) := \{ s(\vec{t}) \mid s \in X \}.$$

If $A \subseteq M$, we write $\overline{A} := M \setminus A$. We are now ready to define *team semantics* for first order logic.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a model, $\varphi \in \mathrm{FO}_L$ and X a team for which $\mathrm{Fr}(\varphi) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(X)$. We define the *truth of φ in the model $\mathcal{M}$ and the team X*, $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ as follows:

- $\mathcal{M} \models_X t_1 = t_2$ iff $s(t_1) = s(t_2)$ for all $s \in X$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \neg t_1 = t_2$ iff $s(t_1) \neq s(t_2)$ for all $s \in X$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X R\vec{t}$ iff $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq R^{\mathcal{M}}$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \neg R\vec{t}$ iff $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq \overline{R^{\mathcal{M}}}$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \psi \wedge \theta$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_X \psi$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_X \theta$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \psi \vee \theta$ iff there are $Y, Y' \subseteq X$ s.t. $Y \cup Y' = X$, $\mathcal{M} \models_Y \psi$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y'} \theta$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists x\, \psi$ iff there exists $F : X \to \mathcal{P}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[F/x]} \psi$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \forall x\, \psi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[M/x]} \psi$.

Remark. The semantics for existential quantifier above allows to select several witnesses for x. In FO it is equivalent to pick only a single witness, and thus the truth condition can be written in an equivalent form (so-called *strict semantics*): $\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists x\, \psi$ iff there is $F : X \to M$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[F/x]} \psi$, where $X[F/x]$ is the team $\{x[F(s)/x] \mid s \in X\}$. Since this truth condition is equivalent also for exclusion logic ([5]), we will use it in the proofs for exclusion logic to simplify them.

For $\varphi \in \mathrm{FO}_L$ and tuple $\vec{x} := x_1 \dots x_k$ we write: $\exists \vec{x}\, \varphi := \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k \varphi$ and $\forall \vec{x}\, \varphi := \forall x_1 \dots \forall x_k \varphi$. It is easy to show that

- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists \vec{x}\, \varphi$ iff there exists $\mathcal{F} : X \to \mathcal{P}(M^k) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}]} \varphi$.
- $\mathcal{M} \models_X \forall \vec{x}\, \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[M^k/\vec{x}]} \varphi$.

In strict semantics the first condition turns into the form: $\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists \vec{x}\, \varphi$ iff there exists $\mathcal{F} : X \to M^k$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}]} \varphi$, where $X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}] := \Big\{ s[\mathcal{F}(s)/\vec{x}] \mid s \in X \Big\}$. First order logic with team semantics has so-called *flatness*-property:

Proposition 2.1 ([18], Flatness)**.** *Let X be a team and $\varphi \in \mathrm{FO}_L$. The following equivalence holds: $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_{\{s\}} \varphi$ for all $s \in X$.*

We use notations $\models^{\mathrm{T}}_s$ and $\models^{\mathrm{T}}$ for truth in a model with standard Tarski semantics. Team semantics can be seen just as a generalization of Tarski semantics:

Proposition 2.2 ([18])**.** *The following equivalences hold:*

$$\mathcal{M} \models^{\mathrm{T}}_s \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models_{\{s\}} \varphi \quad \text{for all } \mathrm{FO}_L\text{-formulas } \varphi \text{ and assignments } s.$$
$$\mathcal{M} \models^{\mathrm{T}} \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models_{\{\emptyset\}} \varphi \quad \text{for all } \mathrm{FO}_L\text{-sentences } \varphi.$$

Note that, by flatness, $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} \models^{\mathrm{T}}_s \varphi$ for all $s \in X$. By Proposition 2.2 it is natural to write $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$, when we mean that $\mathcal{M} \models_{\{\emptyset\}} \varphi$. Note that $\mathcal{M} \models_\emptyset \varphi$ holds trivially for all FO_L-formulas φ by Definition 2.2. In general we say that any logic $\mathcal{L}$ with team semantics has the *empty team property* if $\mathcal{M} \models_\emptyset \varphi$ holds for all $\mathcal{L}$-formulas φ. We define two more important properties for any logic $\mathcal{L}$ with team semantics.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be any logic with team semantics. We say that

- $\mathcal{L}$ is *local*, if the truth of formulas is determined only by the values of free variables in the team, i.e. we have: $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_{X \restriction \mathrm{Fr}(\varphi)} \varphi$.
- $\mathcal{L}$ is *closed downwards* if we have: If $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $\mathcal{M} \models_Y \varphi$.

By flatness it is easy to see that FO is local and closed downwards.

2.2 Inclusion and exclusion logics

Inclusion logic (INC) and exclusion logic (EXC) are obtained by adding inclusion and exclusion atoms, respectively, to first order logic with team semantics:

Definition 2.4. If $\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2$ are k-tuples of L-terms, $\vec{t}_1 \subseteq \vec{t}_2$ is a *k-ary inclusion atom*. INC_L-formulas are formed like FO_L-formulas by allowing the use of (non-negated) inclusion atoms like literals. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a model and X a team s.t. $\mathrm{Vr}(\vec{t}_1\vec{t}_2) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(X)$. We define the truth of $\vec{t}_1 \subseteq \vec{t}_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and X as:

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t}_1 \subseteq \vec{t}_2 \text{ iff for all } s \in X \text{ there exists } s' \in X \text{ s.t. } s(\vec{t}_1) = s'(\vec{t}_2).$$

Equivalently we have $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t}_1 \subseteq \vec{t}_2$ iff $X(\vec{t}_1) \subseteq X(\vec{t}_2)$.

If $\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2$ are k-tuples of L-terms, $\vec{t}_1 \,|\, \vec{t}_2$ is a *k-ary exclusion atom*. EXC_L-formulas are formed as FO_L-formulas, but (non-negated) exclusion atoms may be used as literals are used in FO. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a model and X a team s.t. $\mathrm{Vr}(\vec{t}_1\vec{t}_2) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(X)$. We define the truth of $\vec{t}_1 \mid \vec{t}_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and X as:

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t}_1 \mid \vec{t}_2 \text{ iff for all } s, s' \in X : s(\vec{t}_1) \neq s'(\vec{t}_2).$$

Equivalently we have $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t}_1 \mid \vec{t}_2$ iff $X(\vec{t}_1) \cap X(\vec{t}_2) = \emptyset$ (iff $X(\vec{t}_1) \subseteq \overline{X(\vec{t}_2)}$).

Inclusion-exclusion logic (INEX) is defined simply by combining inclusion and exclusion logics. If $\varphi \in \mathrm{EXC}_L$ contains at most k-ary exclusion atoms, we say that φ is a formula of *k-ary exclusion logic*, EXC[k]. *k-ary inclusion logic* (INC[k]) and *k-ary inclusion-exclusion logic* (INEX[k]) are defined analogously.

The following properties have been shown by Galliani [5]: EXC, INC and INEX are all local and satisfy empty team property. EXC is also closed downwards, unlike INC which is *closed under unions*. If we would use strict semantics for existential quantifier in INC, it would not be local ([5]). This is one of the reasons why the semantics given in Def 2.2 is usually considered more natural.

3 Expressing useful operators for exclusion logic

3.1 k-ary dependence atoms and intuitionistic disjunction

Let us review the semantics for *dependence atoms* of *dependence logic* ([18]). Let $t_1 \dots t_k$ be L-terms. The k-ary dependence atom $=(t_1 \dots t_{k-1}, t_k)$ has the following truth condition: $\mathcal{M} \models_X =(t_1 \dots t_{k-1}, t_k)$ if and only if we have

$$\text{for all } s, s' \in X \text{ for which } s(t_1 \dots t_{k-1}) = s'(t_1 \dots t_{k-1}) \text{ also } s(t_k) = s'(t_k),$$

for all L-models $\mathcal{M}$ and teams X for which $\mathrm{Vr}(t_1 \dots t_k) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(X)$. This truth condition can be read as "the value of t_k is (functionally) dependent on the values of $t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}$". By using Galliani's translation between dependence logic and exclusion logic, we can express k-ary dependence atoms in EXC[k]:

Proposition 3.1 ([5])**.** *Let $\vec{t} = t_1 \dots t_k$ be a tuple of L-terms. The k-ary dependence atom $=(t_1 \dots t_{k-1}, t_k)$ is equivalent with the $\mathrm{EXC}_L[k]$-formula φ:*

$$\varphi := \forall x\,(x = t_k \vee t_1 \dots t_{k-1}x \mid \vec{t}), \quad \textit{where } x \textit{ is a fresh variable.}$$

In particular, we can express *constancy atom*[2] $=(t)$ in EXC[k] for any $k \geq 1$.

The semantics of *intuitionistic disjunction* $\sqcup$ is obtained by lifting the Tarski semantics of classical disjunction from single assignments to teams. That is, $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi \sqcup \psi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi$ or $\mathcal{M} \models_X \psi$. Galliani [4] has shown that this operator can be expressed by using constancy atoms. Hence we can can define it as an abbreviation in EXC[k] for any $k \geq 1$.

3.2 Universal inclusion quantifier and the unification of values

In [17] we have considered inclusion and exclusion dependencies from a new perspective by introducing inclusion and exclusion quantifiers. Let $\vec{x}$ be a k-tuple of variables, $\vec{t}$ a k-tuple of L-terms and $\varphi \in \mathrm{INEX}_L$. We review the semantics for *universal* inclusion and exclusion quantifiers $(\forall \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t})$ and $(\forall \vec{x} \mid \vec{t})$:

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X (\forall \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t})\,\varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models_{X[A/\vec{x}]} \varphi, \text{ where } A = X(\vec{t}).$$
$$\mathcal{M} \models_X (\forall \vec{x} \mid \vec{t})\,\varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models_{X[A/\vec{x}]} \varphi, \text{ where } A = \overline{X(\vec{t})}.$$

[2] $=(t)$ is true in a nonempty team X iff t has a constant value in X, i.e. $|X(t)| = 1$.

To define these quantifiers as abbreviations in INEX we needed to use *both* k-ary inclusion and exclusion atoms. However, we can alternatively define quantifier $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq^e \vec{t})$ as an abbreviation by using only k-ary exclusion atoms (see [17]). This quantifier has the same truth condition as $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t})$ above, when φ is a formula of *exclusion logic*.

Hence the universal inclusion quantifier for k-tuples of variables can be defined for both INEX[k] and EXC[k], although these definitions have to be given differently. From now on we will always use the plain notation $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t})$ and assume it be defined in the right way depending on whether we use it with INEX or EXC.

When defining quantifier $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{t})$, we allowed the variables in the tuple $\vec{x}$ to occur in $\mathrm{Vr}(\vec{t})$. In particular, we accept the quantifiers of the form $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{x})$. Quantifiers of this form may seem trivial, but they turn out to be rather useful operators. Let us analyze their truth condition:

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X (\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{x})\, \varphi \;\text{ iff }\; \mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \varphi, \text{ where } X' = X[X(\vec{x})/\vec{x}\,].$$

Note that the team X' is not necessarily the same team as X, although we have $\mathrm{dom}(X') = \mathrm{dom}(X)$ and even $X'(\vec{x}) = X(\vec{x})$. Consider the following example.

Example 3.1. Let $X = \{s_1, s_2\}$ where $s_1(v_1) = a$, $s_2(v_1) = b$ and $a \neq b$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} X[X(v_1)/v_1] = X[\{a,b\}/v_1] &= \{s_1[a/v_1], s_1[b/v_1], s_2[a/v_1], s_2[b/v_1]\} \\ &= \{s_1, s_2, s_1[b/v_1], s_2[a/v_1]\} \neq X. \end{aligned}$$

We say that the quantifier $(\forall\, \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{x})$ *unifies* the values of the tuple $\vec{x}$ in a team. After executing this operation for a team X, each $s \in X \upharpoonright (\mathrm{dom}(X) \setminus \mathrm{Vr}(\vec{x}))$ "carries" the information on the whole relation $X(\vec{x})$. This also makes the values of the tuple $\vec{x}$ *independent* of all the other variables in $\mathrm{dom}(X)$. To simplify our notation we introduce the following operator.

Definition 3.1. Let $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ be tuples of variables that are not necessarily of the same length. *The unifier of the values of* $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\, \varphi := \; (\forall\, \vec{x}_1 \subseteq \vec{x}_1) \ldots (\forall\, \vec{x}_n \subseteq \vec{x}_n)\, \varphi.$$

Note that if the longest of the tuples $\vec{x}_i$ is a k-tuple, then this operator can be defined in EXC[k] (and in INEX[k]).

If we require the variables in the tuples $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ to be *distinct*, their order does not matter, and we obtain the following truth condition for unifier:

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\, \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \varphi, \text{ where } X' = X[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n].$$

We have $\mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\varphi \equiv \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1) \ldots \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_n)\varphi$, but one should note that usually $\mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1 \ldots \vec{x}_n)\varphi \not\equiv \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\varphi$. To see this, consider X s.t. $v_1, v_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(X)$ and let $X_1 := X[X(v_1v_2)/v_1v_2]$ and $X_2 := X[X(v_1)/v_1, X(v_2)/v_2]$. Now we have $X_1(v_1v_2) = X(v_1v_2)$ but $X_2(v_1v_2) = X(v_1) \times X(v_2)$. Hence X_1 and X_2 are identical only if $X(v_1v_2) = X(v_1) \times X(v_2)$.

Remark. It holds that $\mathbf{U}(v_1v_2,\, v_2v_3)\, \varphi \;\equiv\; \mathbf{U}(v_1, v_2, v_3)\, \varphi \;\equiv\; \mathbf{U}(v_2v_3,\, v_1v_2)\, \varphi$. We can generalize this property of unification to show that the order of the unified tuples is irrelevant, even if they are not distinct. We omit the proof for these claims, since we only use the unifier for distinct tuples in this paper.

This new operator can be used in combination with other logical operators to form new useful tools for the framework of team semantics. We will introduce here two such operators. The definitions are given more generally for INEX, but they can be defined in the same way for EXC as well.

Definition 3.2. Let $\vec{x}$ be a k-tuple of variables and $\varphi \in \mathrm{INEX}_L$. *Unified existential quantifier* $\exists^{\mathbf{U}}$ is defined as: $\exists^{\mathbf{U}} \vec{x}\, \varphi := \exists \vec{x}\, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x})\, \varphi$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\vec{x}$ be a k-tuple and $\varphi \in \mathrm{INEX}_L$. Now we have*

$$\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists^{\mathbf{U}} \vec{x}\, \varphi \text{ iff there exists a nonempty set } A \subseteq M^k \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{M} \vDash_{X[A/\vec{x}]} \varphi.$$

Proof. If X would be an empty team, then the claim would hold trivially, and thus we may assume that $X \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose first that we have $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists^{\mathbf{U}} \vec{x}\, \varphi$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists \vec{x}\, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x})\, \varphi$. Therefore there exists a function $\mathcal{F} : X \to \mathcal{P}(M^k) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} \mathbf{U}(\vec{x})\, \varphi$, where $X' = X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}]$. Then $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'[X'(\vec{x})/\vec{x}]} \varphi$. Since $X[X'(\vec{x})/\vec{x}] = X'[X'(\vec{x})/\vec{x}]$ and $X'(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$, we can choose $A := X'(\vec{x})$.

Suppose then that there exists nonempty $A \subseteq M^k$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X[A/\vec{x}]} \varphi$. We define the function

$$\mathcal{F} : X \to \mathcal{P}(M^k) \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad s \mapsto A \quad \text{for all } s \in X.$$

Let $X' := X[\mathcal{F}/\vec{x}]$, whence $X'(\vec{x}) = A$. Now $X'[X'(\vec{x})/\vec{x}] = X'[A/\vec{x}] = X[A/\vec{x}]$. Hence $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'[X'(\vec{x})/\vec{x}]} \varphi$, and thus $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} \mathbf{U}(\vec{x})\, \varphi$. Therefore $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists \vec{x}\, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x})\, \varphi$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists^{\mathbf{U}} \vec{x}\, \varphi$. □

If we use this quantifier in EXC (or any other downwards closed logic), the following holds: $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \exists^{\mathbf{U}} \vec{x}\, \varphi$ iff there exists $\vec{a} \in M^k$ s.t. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X[\{\vec{a}\}/\vec{x}]} \varphi$. For single variables this truth condition is equivalent with the semantics of the quantifier $\exists^1$ that was introduced in [16].

The following operator will play a very important role in the next section.

Definition 3.3. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathrm{INEX}_L$ and let $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ be k-tuples of distinct variables. *Unifying disjunction for tuples $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$* is defined as:

$$\varphi \underset{\vec{x}_1,\ldots,\vec{x}_n}{\vee^{\mathbf{U}}} \psi := \exists y_1 \exists y_2\, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\Big((y_1 = y_2 \wedge \varphi) \vee (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \psi)\Big), \quad \text{where } y_1, y_2 \text{ are fresh variables.}$$

Proposition 3.3. *Let φ, ψ be INEX_L-formulas and let $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ be k-tuples of distinct variables. Now for all L-models $\mathcal{M}$ with at least two elements we have*

$$\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \varphi \underset{\vec{x}_1,\ldots,\vec{x}_n}{\vee^{\mathbf{U}}} \psi \text{ iff there exist } Y, Y' \subseteq X \text{ s.t. } Y \cup Y' = X, \quad \mathcal{M} \vDash_{Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \vDash_{Y'[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \psi.$$

The idea about the proof of the previous proposition is that before splitting the team, we must "announce" beforehand for each assignment if it will be placed on the left hand side, on the right hand side or both. This is done by giving the same or different values for the variables y_1 and y_2. Because the unification is done after this announcement, but before the actual splitting of the team, all the values will be unified correctly on both sides.

Proof. Because EXC is local, we may assume for this proof that $y_1, y_2 \notin \mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi_{\vec{x}_1,\ldots,\vec{x}_n} \vee^{\mathbf{U}} \psi$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists y_1 \exists y_2 \, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\Big((y_1 = y_2 \wedge \psi) \vee (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \theta)\Big).$$

Thus there exist $F_1 : X \to \mathcal{P}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and $F_2 : X[F_1/y_1] \to \mathcal{P}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{M} \models_{X_1} \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\Big((y_1 = y_2 \wedge \varphi) \vee (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \psi)\Big),$$

where $X_1 = X[F_1/y_1, F_2/y_2]$. Therefore $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_2} (y_1 = y_2 \wedge \varphi) \vee (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \psi)$, where $X_2 = X_1[X_1(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X_1(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$. Thus there exist $Z, Z' \subseteq X_2$ s.t. $Z \cup Z' = X_2$, $\mathcal{M} \models_Z y_1 = y_2 \wedge \varphi$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z'} y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \psi$. Let

$$\begin{cases} Y := \{s \in X \mid \text{There exists } a \in M \text{ s.t. } s[a/y_1, a/y_2] \in X_1\} \\ Y' := \{s \in X \mid \text{There exist } a, b \in M \text{ s.t. } a \neq b \text{ and } s[a/y_1, b/y_2] \in X_1\}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $Y \cup Y' = X$. Also note that since $X(\vec{x}_i) = X_1(\vec{x}_i)$ for each $i \leq n$, it holds that $X_2 = X_1[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/x_n]$. We will show that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Let $r \in Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$. Now there exists $s \in Y$ and tuples $\vec{a}_1 \in X(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, \vec{a}_n \in X(\vec{x}_n)$ s.t. $r = s[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$. Since $s \in Y$, there exists $a \in M$ s.t. $q := s[a/y_1, a/y_2] \in X_1$. Let $q' := q[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$, whence $q' \in X_2$. Since $q'(y_1) = a = q'(y_2)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z'} y_1 \neq y_2$ we have $q' \notin Z'$, and thus it must be that $q' \in Z$. But since now $r = q' \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X) \in Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$, we have shown that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] \subseteq Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Let then $r^* \in Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Now there exists $r \in Z$ s.t. $r^* = r \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Because $\mathcal{M} \models_Z y_1 = y_2$ it must be that $r(y_1) = r(y_2)$. Since $r \in Z \subseteq X_2$ there exists $q \in X_1$ and $\vec{a}_1 \in X(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, \vec{a}_n \in X(\vec{x}_n)$ s.t. $r = q[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$. Let $s := q \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Since $q(y_1) = r(y_1) = r(y_2) = q(y_2)$ and $s \in X$, by the definition of Y we have $s \in Y$. Let $s' := s[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$, whence $s' \in Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$. But now it must also be that $s' = r^*$ and thus $Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X) \subseteq Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$.

We have shown that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Since $\mathcal{M} \models_Z \varphi$, by locality $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)} \varphi$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \varphi$. With a similar argumentation $Y'[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z' \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$ and consequently $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y'[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \psi$.

Suppose then that there exist subteams $Y, Y' \subseteq X$ such that $Y \cup Y' = X$, $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \varphi$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y'[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1,\ldots,X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]} \psi$. Since $|M| \geq 2$, there exist $a, b \in M$ s.t. $a \neq b$. We define the following functions:

$$F_1 : X \to \mathcal{P}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad \begin{cases} s \mapsto \{a\} & \text{if } s \in Y \setminus Y' \\ s \mapsto \{b\} & \text{if } s \in Y' \setminus Y \\ s \mapsto \{a, b\} & \text{if } s \in Y \cap Y' \end{cases}$$

$$F_2 : X[F_1/y_1] \to \mathcal{P}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad s \mapsto \{a\}.$$

We define teams $X_1 := X[F_1/y_1, F_2/y_2]$, $X_2 := X_1[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/x_n]$, $Z := \{s \in X_2 \mid s(y_1) = s(y_2)\}$ and $Z' := \{s \in X_2 \mid s(y_1) \neq s(y_2)\}$. Clearly

now $Z \cup Z' = X_2$, $\mathcal{M} \models_Z y_1 = y_2$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z'} y_1 \neq y_2$. We will then show that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Let $r \in Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$. Now there exists $s \in Y$ and tuples $\vec{a}_1 \in X(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, \vec{a}_n \in X(\vec{x}_n)$ s.t. $r = s[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$. Since $s \in Y$, by the definition of F_1 we have $s[a/y_1] \in X[F_1/y_1]$. Let then $q := s[a/y_1, a/y_2]$ and $q' := q[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$, whence $q \in X_1$ and $q' \in X_2$. Since $q'(y_1) = q'(y_2)$, by the definition of Z we have $q' \in Z$. But now $r = q' \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X) \in Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$, and thus we have shown that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] \subseteq Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$.

Let then $r^* \in Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Now there exists $r \in Z$ s.t. $r^* = r \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. By the definition of Z we have $r(y_1) = r(y_2)$. Since $r \in Z \subseteq X_2$, there exists $q \in X_1$ and tuples $\vec{a}_1 \in X(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, \vec{a}_n \in X(\vec{x}_n)$ such that $r = q[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$. Let $s := q \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Since $q(y_1) = q(y_2)$, by the definition of F_1, we have $s \in Y$. Let $s' := s[\vec{a}_1/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_n/\vec{x}_n]$, whence $s' \in Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$. But now it must be that $s' = r^*$ and thus $Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X) \subseteq Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n]$.

We have shown that $Y[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$. Thus by assumption we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)} \varphi$ and thus by locality $\mathcal{M} \models_Z \varphi$. With similar argumentation we can show that $Y'[X(\vec{x}_1)/\vec{x}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{x}_n)/\vec{x}_n] = Z' \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(X)$ and consequently $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z'} \psi$.

Therefore it holds that $\mathcal{M} \models_Z y_1 = y_2 \wedge \varphi$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Z'} y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \psi$. Furthermore we can conclude that $\mathcal{M} \models_X \exists y_1 \exists y_2 \, \mathbf{U}(\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n)\Big((y_1 = y_2 \wedge \psi) \vee (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \theta)\Big)$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_X \varphi \, {}^{\mathbf{U}}_{\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n} \vee \psi$. □

Remark. We could modify the definition of the unifying disjunction to make it work properly also in the case of single element models. But because in this paper we are mainly using it as a tool it in the translation from ESO[k] to EXC[k], we decided to define it in this more simple form.

4 The expressive power of EXC[k]

4.1 Relationship between EXC and dependence logic

Galliani [5] has shown that, without arity bounds, EXC is equivalent with dependence logic. However, if we consider the bounded arity fragments, this relationship becomes nontrivial. We first review Galliani's translation from exclusion logic to dependence logic (the translation is slightly modified here).

Proposition 4.1 ([5]). *Let $\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2$ be k-tuples of L-terms. The k-ary exclusion atom $\vec{t}_1 \mid \vec{t}_2$ is logically equivalent with the depencende logic formula φ:*

$$\varphi := \forall \vec{y} \exists w_1 \exists w_2 \Big({=}(w_1) \wedge {=}(\vec{y}, w_2) \wedge \Big((w_1 = w_2 \wedge \vec{y} \neq \vec{t}_1) \vee (w_1 \neq w_2 \wedge \vec{y} \neq \vec{t}_2) \Big) \Big),$$

where $\vec{y}$ is a k-tuple of fresh variables and w_1, w_2 are fresh variables.

If we inspect Galliani's translations more closely, we obtain the following:

Corollary 4.2. *The expressive power of* EXC[k] *is in between k-ary dependence logic and (k+1)-ary dependence logic on the level of formulas.*

Proof. By using translation in Proposition 3.1 we can express k-ary dependence atoms with k-ary exclusion atoms. And by using translation in Proposition 4.1 we can express k-ary exclusion atoms with $(k+1)$-ary dependence atoms. □

By this result it is natural to ask whether these inclusions are proper, or does EXC[k+1] collapse to some fragment of dependence logic. Let us inspect the special case $k = 1$ with the following example.

Example 4.1 (Compare with a similar example for INEX in [17])**.** Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. Now we have

(a) $\mathcal{G}$ is disconnected if and only if

$$\mathcal{G} \vDash \forall z \exists x_1 \exists x_2 \Big((x_1 = z \vee x_2 = z) \wedge x_1 \,|\, x_2 \wedge (\forall y_1 \subseteq x_1)(\forall y_2 \subseteq x_2) \neg E y_1 y_2 \Big).$$

(b) $\mathcal{G}$ is k-colorable if and only if

$$\mathcal{G} \vDash \gamma_{\leq k} \sqcup \forall z \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_k \Big(\bigvee_{i \leq k} x_i = z \wedge \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x_i \,|\, x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i \leq k} (\forall y_1 \subseteq x_i)(\forall y_2 \subseteq x_i) \neg E y_1 y_2 \Big),$$

where $\gamma_{\leq k} := \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_k \forall y \Big(\bigvee_{i \leq k} y = x_i \Big)$.

Corollary 4.3. *The expressive power of* EXC[1] *is properly in between* 1*-ary and* 2*-ary dependence logics, on the level of both sentences and formulas.*

Proof. By corollary 4.2 the expressive power of EXC[1] is in between 1-ary and 2-ary dependence logics. By Galliani [5], 1-ary dependence logic is not stronger than FO on the level of sentences. However, by Example 4.1, there are sentences of EXC[1] that cannot be expressed in FO. Thus EXC[1] is strictly stronger than 1-ary dependence logic on the level of sentences.

On the other hand, there are properties that are definable 2-ary dependence logic, but which cannot be expressed in *existential monadic second order logic*, EMSO, such as infinity of a model and even cardinality ([18]). But since INEX[1] is equivalent with EMSO on the level of sentences ([17]), EXC[1] must be strictly weaker than 2-ary dependence logic on the level of sentences. □

4.2 Capturing the arity fragments of ESO with EXC

In this subsection we will compare the expressive power of EXC with *existential second order logic*, ESO. We denote the k-ary fragment of ESO (where at most k-ary relation symbols can be quantified) by ESO[k]. We will formulate a translation from ESO[k] to EXC[k] on the level of sentences by using the idea from the following observation: Suppose that X is a team and $\vec{x}$, $\vec{w}$, $\vec{w}^c$ are tuples variables s.t. $X(\vec{w}^c) = \overline{X(\vec{w})}$. Now we have: $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{w}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \vec{x} \mid \vec{w}^c$.

In our translation from ESO[k] to INEX[k] ([17]) the quantified k-ary relation symbols P_i of a ESO_L-fromula were simply replaced with k-tuples $\vec{w}_i$ of quantified *first order* variables. Then the formulas of the form $P_i\vec{t}$ were replaced with the inclusion atoms $\vec{t} \subseteq \vec{w}_i$ and the formulas of the form $\neg P_i\vec{t}$ with the exclusion

atoms $\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_i$. To eliminate inclusion atoms from this translation we also need to quantify a tuple $\vec{w}_i^c$ of variables for each P_i and set a requirement that $\vec{w}_i^c$ must be given complementary values to $\vec{w}_i$. This requirement is possible to set in exclusion logic if we are restricted to sentences. Then we simply replace inclusion atoms $\vec{t} \subseteq \vec{w}_i$ with the corresponding exclusion atoms $\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_i^c$.

We also need to consider the quantification of the empty set and the full relation M^k as special cases. This is because tuples $\vec{w}_i$ and also their complements $\vec{w}_i^c$ must always be given a nonempty set of values. For this we use special "label variables" w_i° and $w_i^\bullet$ for each relation symbol P_i. We first quantify some constant value for a variable u and then we can give this value for w_i° to "announce" the quantification of the empty set or analogously we can give it for $w_i^\bullet$ to announce the quantification of the full relation. In order to give these label values, there must be at least two elements in the model. For handling the special case of single element models we will use the following easy lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *Let φ be ESO_L-sentence. Now there exists a FO_L-sentence χ, such that we have $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models \chi$, for all L-models $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathcal{I})$ for which $|M| = 1$.*

The remaining problem is that in the translation from ESO to INEX we also needed a new connective called *term value preserving disjunction* ([17]) to avoid the loss of information on the values of variables $\vec{w}_i$ when evaluating disjunctions. This time we can use unifying disjunction instead to avoid the loss of information on the values of both the tuples $\vec{w}_i$ and the tuples $\vec{w}_i^c$. We are now ready to formulate our main theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *For every $\mathrm{ESO}_L[k]$-sentence Φ there exists an $\mathrm{EXC}_L[k]$-sentense φ such that*

$$\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \;\; \textit{iff} \;\; \mathcal{M} \models \Phi.$$

Proof. Since Φ is an $\mathrm{ESO}_L[k]$-sentence, there exists a FO_L-sentence δ and relation symbols $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ so that $\Phi = \exists P_1 \ldots \exists P_n \delta$. Without losing generality, we may assume that $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ are all k-ary. Let $\vec{w}_1, \ldots, \vec{w}_n$ and $\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, \vec{w}_n^c$ be k-tuples of variables and $w_1^\circ, \ldots, w_n^\circ$ and $w_1^\bullet, \ldots, w_n^\bullet$ be variables such that all of these variables are distinct and do not occur in δ.

Let $\psi \in \mathrm{Sf}(\delta)$. The formula ψ' is defined recursively:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi' &= \psi \quad \text{if } \psi \text{ is a literal and } P_i \text{ does not occur in } \psi \text{ for any } i \leq n \\
(P_i\vec{t})' &= (\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_i^c \vee w_i^\bullet = u) \wedge w_i^\circ \neq u \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \\
(\neg P_i\vec{t})' &= (\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_i \vee w_i^\circ = u) \wedge w_i^\bullet \neq u \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \\
(\psi \wedge \theta)' &= \psi' \wedge \theta' \\
(\psi \vee \theta)' &= \psi' \mathbin{\veebar^{\mathbf{U}}} \theta', \qquad \text{where } \veebar^{\mathbf{U}} := \bigvee^{\mathbf{U}}_{\vec{w}_1, \ldots, \vec{w}_n, \vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, \vec{w}_n^c} \\
(\exists x\, \psi)' &= \exists x\, \psi', \;\; (\forall x\, \psi)' = \forall x\, \psi'.
\end{aligned}$$

Let χ be a FO_L-sentence determined by the Lemma 4.4 for the sentence Φ and let $\vec{z}$ be a k-tuple of fresh variables. Let $\gamma_{=1}$ be a shorthand for the sentence $\forall z_1 \forall z_2 (z_1 = z_2)$. Now we can define the sentence φ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi := (\gamma_{=1} \wedge \chi) \sqcup \exists u \exists w_1^\circ \ldots \exists w_n^\circ \exists w_1^\bullet \ldots \exists w_n^\bullet \\
\forall \vec{z} \exists \vec{w}_1 \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n \exists \vec{w}_1^c \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n^c \Big(\bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta' \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly φ is an $\mathrm{EXC}_L[k]$-sentence.

We write $V^* := \mathrm{Vr}(uw_1^\circ \dots w_n^\circ w_1^\bullet \dots w_n^\bullet \vec{w}_1 \dots \vec{w}_n \vec{w}_1^c \dots \vec{w}_n^c)$.

Before proving the claim of this theorem, we prove the following two lemmas:

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an L-model with at least two elements. Let $\mu \in \mathrm{Sf}(\delta)$ and let X a team for which $V^* \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(X)$ and the following assumptions hold:*

$$\begin{cases} X(\vec{w}_i) \cup X(\vec{w}_i^c) = M^k \ \text{ for each } i \leq n. \\ \text{The values of } w_i^\circ, w_i^\bullet \ (i \leq n) \text{ and } u \text{ are constants in } X. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{M}' := \mathcal{M}[\vec{A}/\vec{P}]$ $(= \mathcal{M}[A_1/P_1, \dots, A_n/P_n])$, where

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } X(w_i^\circ) = X(u) \text{ and } X(w_i^\bullet) \neq X(u) \\ M^k & \text{if } X(w_i^\bullet) = X(u) \text{ and } X(w_i^\circ) \neq X(u) \\ X(\vec{w}_i) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Now the following implication holds: If $\mathcal{M} \models_X \mu'$, then $\mathcal{M}' \models_X \mu$.

We prove this claim by structural induction on μ:

- If μ is a literal and P_i does not occur in μ for any $i \leq n$, then the claim holds trivially since $\mu' = \mu$.

- Let $\mu = P_j\vec{t}$ for some $j \leq n$.

  Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \models_X (P_j\vec{t})'$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_X (\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j^c \vee w_j^\bullet = u) \wedge w_j^\circ \neq u$. Because the values of u, w_j° are constants in X and $\mathcal{M} \models_X w_j^\circ \neq u$, we have $X(w_j^\circ) \neq X(u)$. If $X(w_j^\bullet) = X(u)$, then $A_j = M^k$ and thus trivially $\mathcal{M}' \models_X P_j\vec{t}$.

  Suppose then that $X(w_j^\bullet) \neq X(u)$ whence $A_j = X(\vec{w}_j)$. Because the values of u, $w_j^\bullet$ are constants in X and $\mathcal{M} \models_X (\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j^c \vee w_j^\bullet = u)$, it must hold that $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j^c$. Now $X(\vec{t}) \cap X(\vec{w}_j^c) = \emptyset$ and $X(\vec{w}_j) \cup X(\vec{w}_j^c) = M^k$. Thus $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq \overline{X(\vec{w}_j^c)} \subseteq X(\vec{w}_j) = A_j$ and therefore $\mathcal{M}' \models_X P_j\vec{t}$.

- Let $\mu = \neg P_j\vec{t}$ for some $j \leq n$.

  Suppose first that $\mathcal{M} \models_X (\neg P_j\vec{t})'$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_X (\vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j \vee w_j^\circ = u) \wedge w_j^\bullet \neq u$. Because the values of u, $w_j^\bullet$ are constants and $\mathcal{M} \models_X w_j^\bullet \neq u$, we have $X(w_j^\bullet) \neq X(u)$. If $X(w_j^\circ) = X(u)$, then $A_j = \emptyset$ and thus trivially $\mathcal{M}' \models_X \neg P_j\vec{t}$.

  Suppose then that $X(w_i^\circ) \neq X(u)$ whence $A_j = X(\vec{w}_j)$. Because the values of u, w_j° are constants in X and $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j \vee w_j^\circ = u$, we have $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j$. Now $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq \overline{X(\vec{w}_j)} = \overline{A_j}$ and thus $\mathcal{M}' \models_X \neg P_j\vec{t}$.

- The case $\mu = \psi \wedge \theta$ is straightforward to prove.

- Let $\mu = \psi \vee \theta$.

  Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \models_X (\psi \vee \theta)'$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_X \psi' \mathbin{\underline{\vee}^{\mathbf{U}}} \theta'$. By Proposition 3.3 there exist $Y_1, Y_2 \subseteq X$ s.t. $Y_1 \cup Y_2 = X$, $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y_1^*} \psi'$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y_2^*} \theta'$, where

$$\begin{cases} Y_1^* := Y_1[X(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n, X(\vec{w}_1^c)/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n^c)/\vec{w}_n^c] \\ Y_2^* := Y_2[X(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n, X(\vec{w}_1^c)/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n^c)/\vec{w}_n^c]. \end{cases}$$

Now the sets of values for $\vec{w}_i$ and $\vec{w}_i^c$ are the same in Y_1^* and Y_2^* as in X. Because the values of u and w_i°, $w_i^\bullet$ are constants in X they have (the same) constant values in Y_1^* and Y_2^*. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, we have $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_{Y_1^*} \psi$ and $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_{Y_2^*} \theta$. Since none of the variables in V^* occurs in $\psi \vee \theta$, by locality $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_{Y_1} \psi$ and $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_{Y_2} \theta$. Therefore $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_X \psi \vee \theta$.

- The cases $\mu = \exists x\, \psi$ and $\mu = \forall x\, \psi$ are straightforward to prove (note that the quantification of x does not change the sets values of the variables in V^*, and thus the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 hold in the resulting team after the quantification of x).

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an L-model with at least two elements. Let $\mu \in \mathrm{Sf}(\delta)$ and X be a team such that $\mathrm{dom}(X) = \mathrm{Fr}(\mu)$. Assume that $A_1, \ldots, A_n \subseteq M^k$, $\mathcal{M}' := \mathcal{M}[\vec{A}/\vec{P}\,]$ and $a, b \in M$ s.t. $a \neq b$. Let*

$$X' := X\Big[\{a\}/u, B_1^\circ/w_1^\circ, \ldots, B_n^\circ/w_n^\circ, B_1^\bullet/w_1^\bullet, \ldots, B_n^\bullet/w_n^\bullet, B_1/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, B_n/\vec{w}_n, B_1^c/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, B_n^c/\vec{w}_n^c\Big],$$

$$\text{where } \begin{cases} B_i^\circ = \{a\},\ B_i^\bullet = \{b\} \text{ and } B_i = B_i^c = M & \text{if } A_i = \emptyset \\ B_i^\circ = \{b\},\ B_i^\bullet = \{a\} \text{ and } B_i = B_i^c = M & \text{if } A_i = M^k \\ B_i^\circ = \{b\},\ B_i^\bullet = \{b\},\ B_i = A_i \text{ and } B_i^c = \overline{A_i} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Now the following implication holds: If $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_X \mu$, then $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} \mu'$.

We prove this claim by structural induction on μ. Note that if $X = \emptyset$, then also $X' = \emptyset$ and thus the claim holds by empty team property. Hence we may assume that $X \neq \emptyset$.

- If μ is a literal and P_i does not occur in μ for any $i \leq n$, then the claim holds by locality since $\mu' = \mu$.

- Let $\mu = P_j\vec{t}$ for some $j \leq n$.

  Suppose first that $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_X P_j\vec{t}$, i.e. $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq P_j^{\mathcal{M}'} = A_j$. Since $X \neq \emptyset$, also $X(\vec{t}) \neq \emptyset$ and thus $A_j \neq \emptyset$. Hence $X'(w_j^\circ) = \{b\}$, and thus $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} w_i^\circ \neq u$ since $X'(u) = \{a\}$. If $A_j = M^k$, then $X'(w_i^\bullet) = \{a\}$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} w_j^\bullet = u$, whence $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (\vec{t} \,|\, \vec{w}_i^c \vee w_i^\bullet = u) \wedge w_i^\circ \neq u$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (P_j\vec{t})'$.

  Suppose then that $A_j \neq M^k$. Now we have $X'(\vec{w}_j^c) = \overline{A_j}$, i.e. $\overline{X'(w_j^c)} = A_j$, and thus $X'(\vec{t}) = X(\vec{t}) \subseteq A_j = \overline{X'(\vec{w}_j^c)}$. Hence $\mathcal{M} \vDash_X \vec{t} \mid \vec{w}_j^c$ and therefore $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (\vec{t} \,|\, \vec{w}_i^c \vee w_i^\bullet = u) \wedge w_i^\circ \neq u$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (P_j\vec{t})'$.

- Let $\mu = \neg P_j\vec{t}$ for some $j \leq n$.

  Suppose that $\mathcal{M}' \vDash_X \neg P_j\vec{t}$, i.e. $X(\vec{t}) \subseteq \overline{P_j^{\mathcal{M}'}} = \overline{A_j}$. Since $X \neq \emptyset$, $X(\vec{t}) \neq \emptyset$ and thus $\overline{A_j} \neq \emptyset$, i.e. $A_j \neq M^k$. Hence $X'(w_j^\bullet) = \{b\}$, and thus $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} w_i^\bullet \neq u$ since $X'(u) = \{a\}$. If $A_j = \emptyset$, then $X'(w_i^\circ) = \{a\}$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} w_j^\circ = u$, whence $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (\vec{t} \,|\, \vec{w}_i \vee w_i^\circ = u) \wedge w_i^\bullet \neq u$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \vDash_{X'} (\neg P_j\vec{t})'$.

Suppose then that we have $A_j \neq \emptyset$. Then $X'(\vec{w}_j) = A_j$ and thus it holds that $X'(\vec{t}) = X(\vec{t}) \subseteq \overline{A_j} = \overline{X'(w_j)}$. Hence we have $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{t} \,|\, \vec{w}_j$ and therefore $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} (\vec{t} \,|\, \vec{w}_i \vee w_i^\circ = u) \wedge w_i^\bullet \neq u$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} (\neg P_j \vec{t})'$.

- The case $\mu = \psi \wedge \theta$ is straightforward to prove.

- Let $\mu = \psi \vee \theta$.

  Suppose that $\mathcal{M}' \models_X \psi \vee \theta$, i.e. there exist $Y_1, Y_2 \subseteq X$ s.t. $Y_1 \cup Y_2 = X$, $\mathcal{M}' \models_{Y_1} \psi$ and $\mathcal{M}' \models_{Y_2} \theta$. Let Y_1', Y_2' be the teams obtained by extending the teams Y_1, Y_2 as X' is obtained by extending X. Then, by the induction hypothesis, we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y_1'} \psi'$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{Y_2'} \theta'$. Now the following holds:

  $$\begin{cases} Y_1' = Y_1'[X(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n, X(\vec{w}_1^c)/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n^c)/\vec{w}_n^c] \\ Y_2' = Y_2'[X(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n, X(\vec{w}_1^c)/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, X(\vec{w}_n^c)/\vec{w}_n^c]. \end{cases}$$

  Note that also $Y_1', Y_2' \subseteq X'$ and $Y_1' \cup Y_2' = X'$. Thus by Proposition 3.3 $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \psi' \mathbin{\mathbf{U}} \theta'$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} (\psi \vee \theta)'$.

- Let $\mu = \exists x \, \psi$ (the case $\mu = \forall x \, \psi$ is proven similarly).

  Suppose that $\mathcal{M}' \models_X \exists x \, \psi$, i.e. there exists $F : X \to M$ s.t. $\mathcal{M}' \models_{X[F/x]} \psi$. Let $F' : X' \to M$ such that $s \mapsto F(s \restriction \mathrm{Fr}(\mu))$ for each $s \in X'$. Note that F' is well defined since $\mathrm{dom}(X) = \mathrm{Fr}(\mu)$ by the assumption.

  Let $(X[F/x])'$ be a team that is obtained by extending the team $X[F/x]$ analogously as X' is obtained by extending X. Now by induction hypothesis we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{(X[F/x])'} \psi'$. By the definition of F' it is easy to see that $(X[F/x])' = X'[F'/x]$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'[F'/x]} \psi'$. Hence we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \exists x \, \psi'$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} (\exists x \, \psi)'$.

We are ready prove: $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$. Suppose first $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$, i.e. $\mathcal{M} \models \gamma_{=1} \wedge \chi$ or

$$(\star) \qquad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} \models{}& \exists u \, \exists w_1^\circ \ldots \exists w_n^\circ \, \exists w_1^\bullet \ldots \exists w_n^\bullet \\ & \forall \vec{z} \, \exists \vec{w}_1 \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n \, \exists \vec{w}_1^c \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n^c \Big(\bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta' \Big). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{M} \models \gamma_{=1} \wedge \chi$, the claim holds by Lemma 4.4. Suppose then $(\star)$, whence by the (strict) semantics of existential quantifier there are $a, b_1 \ldots b_n, b_1', \ldots, b_n' \in M$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{M} \models_{X_1} \forall \vec{z} \, \exists \vec{w}_1 \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n \, \exists \vec{w}_1^c \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n^c \Big(\bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta' \Big),$$

where $X_1 := \{\emptyset[a/u, b_1/w_1^\circ, \ldots, b_n/w_n^\circ, b_1'/w_1^\bullet, \ldots, b_n'/w_n^\bullet]\}$. Note that since X_1 consists only of a single assignment, the values of u, w_i° and $w_i^\bullet$ $(i \leq n)$ are trivially constants in the team X_1. Let $X_2 := X_1[M^k/\vec{z}]$. Now there exist functions $\mathcal{F}_i : X_2[\mathcal{F}_1/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{i-1}/\vec{w}_{i-1}] \to M^k$ such that

$$\mathcal{M} \models_{X_3} \exists \vec{w}_1^c \ldots \exists \vec{w}_n^c \Big(\bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta' \Big),$$

where $X_3 := X_2[\mathcal{F}_1/\vec{w}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_n/\vec{w}_n]$.

Hence there exist functions $\mathcal{F}_i' : X_3[\mathcal{F}_1'/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{i-1}'/\vec{w}_{i-1}^c] \to M^k$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta'$, where $X_4 := X_3[\mathcal{F}_1'/\vec{w}_1^c, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_n'/\vec{w}_n^c]$. Since $X_4(\vec{z}) = M^k$ and $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c)$, it is easy to see that $X(\vec{w}_i) \cup$

$X(\vec{w}_i^c) = M^k$ for each $i \leq n$. Now all the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 hold for the team X_4. Let $\mathcal{M}' := \mathcal{M}[\vec{A}/\vec{P}]$, where

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } X_4(w_i^\circ) = X_4(u) \text{ and } X_4(w_i^\bullet) \neq X_4(u) \\ M^k & \text{if } X_4(w_i^\bullet) = X_4(u) \text{ and } X_4(w_i^\circ) \neq X_4(u) \\ X_4(\vec{w}_i) & \text{else} \end{cases} \qquad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \delta'$, by Lemma 4.6 we have $\mathcal{M}' \models_{X_4} \delta$. By locality $\mathcal{M}' \models \delta$, and therefore $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$.

Suppose then that $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$. If $|M| = 1$, then by Lemma 4.4 we have $\mathcal{M} \models \gamma_{=1} \wedge \chi$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$. Hence we may assume that $|M| \geq 2$, whence there exist $a, b \in M$ s.t. $a \neq b$. Since $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$, there exist $A_1, \dots, A_n \subseteq M^k$ s.t. $\mathcal{M}[\vec{A}/\vec{P}] \models \delta$. Let

$$X' := \{\emptyset\}\big[\{a\}/u, B_1^\circ/w_1^\circ, \dots, B_n^\circ/w_n^\circ, B_1^\bullet/w_1^\bullet, \dots, B_n^\bullet/w_n^\bullet, \\ B_1/\vec{w}_1, \dots, B_n/\vec{w}_n, B_1^c/\vec{w}_1^c, \dots, B_n^c/\vec{w}_n^c\big],$$

where $B_i^\circ, B_i^\bullet, B_i, B_i^c$ $(i \leq n)$ are defined as in the assumptions of Lemma 4.7. Since $\mathcal{M}[\vec{A}/\vec{P}] \models \delta$, by Lemma 4.7 we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \delta'$. Let

$$\mathcal{F} : \{\emptyset\} \to M^{2n+1}, \quad \emptyset \mapsto a b_1 \dots b_n b_1' \dots b_n',$$
$$\text{where} \quad \begin{cases} b_i = a \text{ if } A_i = \emptyset \\ b_i = b \text{ else} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} b_i' = a \text{ if } A_i = M^k \\ b_i' = b \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Let $X_1 := \{\emptyset\}[\mathcal{F}/u w_1^\circ \dots w_n^\circ w_1^\bullet \dots w_n^\bullet]$ and let $X_2 := X_1[M^k/\vec{z}]$. We fix some $\vec{b}_i \in A_i$ for each $i \leq n$ for which $A_i \neq \emptyset$ and define the functions

$$\mathcal{F}_i : X_2[\mathcal{F}_1/\vec{w}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{i-1}/\vec{w}_{i-1}] \to M^k, \quad \begin{cases} s \mapsto s(\vec{z}) & \text{if } s(\vec{z}) \in A_i \text{ or } A_i = \emptyset \\ s \mapsto \vec{b}_i & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Let $X_3 := X_2[\mathcal{F}_1/\vec{w}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n/\vec{w}_n]$. We fix some $\vec{b}_i' \in \overline{A_i}$ for each $i \leq n$ for which $A_i \neq M^k$ and define

$$\mathcal{F}_i' : X_3[\mathcal{F}_1'/\vec{w}_1^c, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{i-1}'/\vec{w}_{i-1}^c] \to M^k, \ \begin{cases} s \mapsto s(\vec{z}) & \text{if } s(\vec{z}) \in \overline{A_i} \text{ or } A_i = M^k \\ s \mapsto \vec{b}_i' & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Let $X_4 := X_3[\mathcal{F}_1'/\vec{w}_1^c, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n'/\vec{w}_n^c]$. By the definitions of the functions $\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_i'$ it is easy to see that $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c)$. Also, clearly for each $s \in X_4$ and $i \leq n$ it holds that $s(w_i^\circ) \in B_i^\circ$, $s(w_i^\bullet) \in B_i^\bullet$, $s(\vec{w}_i) \in B_i$ and $s(\vec{w}_i^c) \in B_i^c$. By the definitions of the choice functions for the variables in V^* we have:

$$X_4[X_4(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1, \dots, X_4(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n, X_4(\vec{w}_1)/\vec{w}_1^c, \dots, X_4(\vec{w}_n)/\vec{w}_n^c] = X'[M^k/\vec{z}].$$

Hence $X_4 \subseteq X'[M^k/\vec{z}]$. Since $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'} \delta'$, by locality $\mathcal{M} \models_{X'[M^k/\vec{z}]} \delta'$. Since EXC is closed downwards, we have $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \delta'$. Hence $\mathcal{M} \models_{X_4} \bigwedge_{i \leq n} (\vec{z} = \vec{w}_i \vee \vec{z} = \vec{w}_i^c) \wedge \delta'$ and furthermore $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$. □

Corollary 4.8. *On the level of sentences* $\mathrm{EXC}[k] \equiv \mathrm{ESO}[k]$.

Proof. In [17] we presented a translation from $\mathrm{EXC}[k]$ to $\mathrm{ESO}[k]$. By Theorem 4.5, on the level of sentences, there is also a translation from $\mathrm{ESO}[k]$ to $\mathrm{EXC}[k]$. □

4.3 Relationship between INC[k] and EXC[k]

Since by [17], INEX[k] captures ESO[k], by Corollary 4.8 we can deduce that INEX[k] $\equiv$ EXC[k] on the level of sentences. Hence on the level of sentences k-ary inclusion atoms do not increase the expressive power of EXC[k].

By Dawar [2], 3-colorability of a graph cannot be expressed in fixed point logic. Since, by [7], INC is equivalent with positive greatest fixed point logic, this property cannot be expressed in INC either. However, since it can be expressed in EXC[1], INC[k] is strictly weaker than EXC[k] on the level of sentences.

This consequence is somewhat surprising since inclusion and exclusion atoms can be seen as duals of each other ([17]). As a matter of fact, exclusion atoms can also be simulated with inclusion atoms in an analogous way as we simulated inclusion atoms with exclusion atoms. To see this, suppose that X is a team and $\vec{x}$, $\vec{w}$, $\vec{w}^c$ are tuples variables s.t. $X(\vec{w}^c) = \overline{X(\vec{w})}$. Now we have: $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{x} \,|\, \vec{w}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models_X \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{w}^c$ (compare with our observation in the beginning of section 4.2).

By the observation above, it would be natural to assume that ESO$_L$[k]-sentences could be expressed with INC[k]-sentences similarly as we did with EXC[k]-sentences. But this is impossible as we deduced above. The problem is that in INC there is no way to quantify tuples $\vec{w}$ and $\vec{w}^c$ in such a way that their values would be complements of each other. However, there is a possibility this could be done in inclusion logic with *strict semantics*, since Hannula and Kontinen [10] have shown that this logic is equivalent with ESO. We will study this question in a future work.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we analyzed the expressive power of k-ary exclusion atoms. We first observed that the expressive power of EXC[k] is between k-ary and (k+1)-ary dependence logics, and that when $k = 1$, these inclusions are proper. By simulating the use of inclusion atoms with exclusion atoms and by using the complementary values, we were able to translate ESO[k]-sentences into EXC[k]. By combining this with our earlier translation we managed to capture the k-ary fragment of ESO by using only k-ary exclusion atoms, which resolves the expressive power of EXC[k] on the level of sentences. However, on the level of formulas our results are not yet conclusive.

As mentioned in the introduction, by [3], on the level of sentences k-ary dependence logic captures the fragment of ESO where (k−1)-ary functions can be quantified. Thus 1-ary dependence logic is not more expressive than FO, but 2-ary dependence logic is strictly stronger than EMSO – which can be captured with EXC[1]. Also, the question whether EXC[k+1] is properly in between k- and (k+1)-ary dependence logic for any $k \geq 2$, amounts to showing whether k-ary relational fragment of ESO is properly between (k−1)-ary and k-ary functional fragments of ESO. To our best knowledge this is still an open problem, even though, by the result of Ajtai [1], both relational and functional fragments of ESO have a strict arity hierarchy (over arbitrary vocabulary).

In order to formulate the translation in our main theorem, we needed use a new operator to called *unifier* which is expressible in exclusion logic. This is a

very simple but interesting operator for the framework of team semantics by its own right, and its properties deserve to be studied further – either independently or by adding it to some other logics with team semantics.

References

[1] M. Ajtai. Σ^1_1-formulae on finite structures. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 724(1):1–48, 1983.

[2] A. Dawar. A restricted second order logic for finite structures. *Inf. Comput.*, 143(2):154–174, 1998.

[3] A. Durand and J. Kontinen. Hierarchies in dependence logic. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 13(4):31, 2012.

[4] P. Galliani. *The Dynamics of Imperfect Information*. Amsterdam: Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, 2012.

[5] P. Galliani. Inclusion and exclusion dependencies in team semantics - on some logics of imperfect information. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 163(1):68–84, 2012.

[6] P. Galliani, M. Hannula, and J. Kontinen. Hierarchies in independence logic. In *CSL 2013*, pages 263–280, 2013.

[7] P. Galliani and L. Hella. Inclusion logic and fixed point logic. In *CSL 2013*, pages 281–295, 2013.

[8] E. Grädel and J. A. Väänänen. Dependence and independence. *Studia Logica*, 101(2):399–410, 2013.

[9] M. Hannula. Hierarchies in inclusion logic with lax semantics. In *ICLA 2015*, pages 100–118, 2015.

[10] M. Hannula and J. Kontinen. Hierarchies in independence and inclusion logic with strict semantics. *J. Log. Comput.*, 25(3):879–897, 2015.

[11] J. Hintikka and G. Sandu. Informational independence as a semantical phenomenon. In J. E. Fenstad, editor, *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science VIII*, pages 571–589. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.

[12] J. Hintikka and G. Sandu. Game-theoretical semantics. In J. van Benthem and A. ter Meulen, editors, *Handbook of Logic and Language*, pages 361–410. Elsevier, 1997.

[13] W. Hodges. Compositional semantics for a language of imperfect information. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 5(4):539–563, 1997.

[14] T. Hyttinen, G. Paolini, and J. Väänänen. Quantum team logic and Bell's inequalities. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 8:722–742, 12 2015.

[15] J. Kontinen, S. Link, and J. A. Väänänen. Independence in database relations. In *WoLLIC 2013*, pages 179–193, 2013.

[16] J. Kontinen and J. A. Väänänen. On definability in dependence logic. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 18(3):317–332, 2009.

[17] R. Rönnholm. Capturing k-ary inclusion-exclusion logic with k-ary existential second order logic. *arXiv:1502.05632 [math.LO]*, 2015.

[18] J. A. Väänänen. *Dependence Logic - A New Approach to Independence Friendly Logic*, volume 70 of *London Mathematical Society student texts*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.